Just say no to FCC regulation of the Internet.

Keep the Internet free from government regulation.

Here are some supporting document from the founding documents that helped creating the public Internet. They clearly do not support government regulation of the Internet. In fact they point to a clear separation of Government and the internet.

 U.S. Commerce Department Formation of ICANN.
Cleary stated that ?neither national governments acting as sovereigns nor Intergovernmental organizations acting as representatives of governments should Participate in management of the Internet.?1

1 Department of Commerce, NTIA, ?Management of Internet Names and Addresses,?
Statement of Policy, Federal Register 63, No. 111 (June 10, 1998) 31741.

Ira Magaziner, the White House policy advisor who presided over the process, of creating the public Internet Said.

?We believe
That the Internet as it develops needs to have a different type of coordination
Structure than has been typical for international institutions in the industrial age.
Governmental processes and inter-governmental processes by definition work too
Slowly and somewhat too bureaucratically for the pace and flexibility of this new Information age.?4

4 Ira Magaziner, introductory comments at the first International Forum, Reston, Virginia meeting, July 1, 1998.

 Cable and telephone companies have led the way in bringing broadband to millions of Americans. The evidence today is that their internet access consumers have the ability to reach any internet content. Indeed, cable and telephone companies? practices already track well the Internet Principles we indorse today. I remain confident that the marketplace will continue to ensure that these principals are maintained. I also am confident; therefore, that regulation is not nor will be required.

FCC Chairman Kevin Martin August 5 2005

There is no need for the FCC?s Network Neutrality plan since there are already free market checks and balances in place to prevent this.

The problem with the net neutrality plan of the FCC is that there is no need for the plan. I ?am a broadband internet provider in Virginia and West Virginia and I have meet with the FCC in DC to discuss the issue of Net Neutrality and it became abundantly clear that the FCC has no real world understanding of this issue. In my opinion the FCC?s main goal with this plan is to allow them to add Universal service fee's to customers? broadband bills. It seems that the FCC is seeing their power and revenue generated from regulated services disappear as more and more services that they currently regulate move to the Internet and out of their control such as VOIP and now VIDEO broadcasters. The FCC solution to this loss of power and in order to try and maintain control and to keep their funding they receive from Universal service fees is to regulate the Internet by reclassifying it from an information resource to a telecommunication service. Basically moving the Internet from a library?s and news papers status were it is now and moving it to the same heavily regulated category as Radio, Television, Cable and satellite services. This idea that somehow the Internet will become more open by adding government regulation is against all common sense.   What every broadband Internet user in the USA will notice if the FCC get's it way and adds title 2 regulation to the Internet will be universal service fees added to Broadband Internet service and a higher monthly cost for broadband services . This FCC Net Neutrality plan also opens the door for additional government regulation of the Internet and the possibility of Internet content control. This is clearly not the FCC intent but there is nothing to stop the next FCC director from adding an Internet content and enforcement policy such as they currently have on Television or Radio broadcast providers. Once the FCC gets the ability to regulate the Internet under title 2 the legal precedent is already set.

 Under these proposed regulations the FCC will also try and require ISP's to not prioritize any internet traffic over any other type of traffic. There are problems with this idea. First VOIP service would become unusable without prioritizing VOIP traffic and most Video service would constantly be buffering as well. The ISP?s manage and prioritizes their network traffic based on what is the most important to the majority of their customer base. Currently the largest majority of customer that would be effected if there were no network priorities would be those that use VOIP and Video services since they requires very low network latency compared to Web Browsing or email services. As to the FCC claims that ISP?s may block Internet content or legal Internet services. This is of course technically possible but not likely. Any Broadband ISP that would block or delay content that their Broadband customers wanted to access would quickly loose customer base to other Broadband providers or create an opportunity for new Broadband providers. In most locations in the USA there are at least 3 broadband providers and in some cases there are as many as 15 broadband providers to choose from. There is no need for the FCC?s so called Network Neutrality plan since there are already free market checks and balances in place to prevent this. The internet is the ultimate example of Free Speech and Free enterprise. Let?s not take a chance on the government regulation of the Internet.